

REMARKS

In the office action dated June 26, 2007, the examiner rejected claims 1-46 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Casement et al. USPN 5,969,748. Applicants have amended certain claims to further clarify the claimed invention. In view of the foregoing amendments and subsequent remarks, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the examiner's rejections.

Casement describes a time lock function and a separate content based lock function. To the extent both functions can be active at the same time, Applicants submit that the time lock function acts to block all viewing of programs during a selected period of time and the content based lock function acts to block viewing of programs whose program content exceeds a content based specification when the time is outside the selected period of time.

At page 2—3 of the office action, the examiner asserts that by teaching the selection of a finite time range, e.g., 8:00PM-10:00PM, Casement inherently teaches the selection of the finite time range extending 22 hours from 10:00PM to 8:00PM. The examiner further asserts that Casement "compares the selected content based specification (user defining rating) with received content-based indicator (Rating of the EPG or Program schedule) to impair the program signal if the rating exceeds the content specification when reference time falls within the first finite time range specification." Since Casement only teaches the explicit selection of a finite time range for its time lock function, where all viewing is blocked for the selected period of time, if the user selects 8pm to 10pm as the period of time for operation of the time lock function, then Applicant must assume that the Examiner's reference to the "first finite time range specification" during which a content-based indicator is compared to a content-based specification is referring to the inherently selected time range of 10pm to 8pm. As such, the examiner's assertion that Casement

"compares the reference time with one of the finite time ranges [i.e., 10pm to 8pm,] and when the reference time falls outside one of the finite time range [i.e., within 8pm to 10pm], the user is allow[ed] to view the TV program without user input" is incorrect as all viewing would be blocked during the 8pm to 10pm time period, the period for the time lock function, unless the user were to input a passcode.

At page 5 of the office action, the examiner again incorrectly asserts that

Casement

compare[es] (RL 16-22 which inherently includes a Microprocessor 'MC', fig.3-4, col.4, line 25-col.5, line 17 and col.6, line 30-col.7, line 1 +) the reference time with the first finite time range; allowing user review of the user discernible information without user input if the reference time is outside the first finite time range specification;

compare[es] (MC) the selected content-based specification with the received content based indicator when the reference time falls within the first finite time range specification and impairing (MC) the program signal if the received content-based indicator exceeds the content-based specification associated with the first time range specification (fig.3-4, col.3, lines 33-43, col.4, line 25-col.5, line 17 and col.6, line 30-col.7, line 1 +)...

These statements are inconsistent with the teaching of Casement. Depending on what time range is considered the first finite time range – the explicitly selected time range or the inherently selected time range – all viewing would be blocked when the reference time is within the first finite time range if the first finite time range is the explicitly selected time range (e.g., 8pm to 10pm) or all viewing would be blocked when the reference time is outside the first finite time range if the first finite time range is the inherently selected time range (e.g., 10pm to 8pm). See, Figures 4 and column 6, line 30-column 7, line 20 of Casement. Similarly, depending on what time range is considered the first finite time range, comparison to a content-based specification will either take place when the reference time is within the first finite time range or when the reference time is outside the first finite time range. If both the time lock function and the content

based lock function are action, at no time does viewing take place within the Casement system without either user of a passcode or at least the comparison by the system of the program content to a content based specification.

Moreover, in referring to the claimed inventions, Casement does not teach, describe or suggest the selection of a first content based specification and a second content based specification which is different from the first content specification and selection of first and second finite time range specifications, which are different from one another and correspond to the first and second content based specification, wherein the user is allowed to view user discernible information without user input and without comparison to a content based specification if the reference time is outside the first and second finite time range specifications and impairing the program signal if the received content-based indicator exceeds the content-based specification associated with the first time range specifications when the reference time falls within the first finite time range specification and the second time range specification when the reference time falls within the second finite time range specification, as claimed in claim 1.

Casement also does not teach, describe or suggest

allowing user review of user discernible information **without user input and without comparison of the content base indicator to a content based specification** if the reference time is outside the one or more finite time range specifications;

comparing the received content-based rating when the reference time falls within one of the one or more finite time range specifications with the content-based specification associated with the one of the one or more finite time range specifications; and

impairing the program signal if the received content-based rating exceeds the content-based rating associated with the one of the one or more finite time range specifications.

as claimed in claim 13.

Furthermore, since Casement either blocks all viewing when the reference time falls

within the finite time range specification or blocks viewing of a program if its content exceeds a content based specification when the reference time is outside the finite time range specification, Casement does not teach disablement of a V-Chip or parental control system when the reference time falls outside the finite time range specification as claimed in claims 19 and 25.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Casement does not meet or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 13, 19 and 25. Accordingly, claims 1, 13, 19 and 25, and claims 2-12, 14—18, 20-24, and 26-46 by virtue of their dependence upon 1, 13, 19 and 25, meet the requirements for patentability under 35 USC 102(e).

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action on the merits of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: December 12, 2007

By: /Kenneth S Roberts/
Kenneth S. Roberts
Reg. No. 38,358

4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710